Case 2:15-cv-07734-GHK-AFM $\,$ Document 1 $\,$ Filed 10/01/15 $\,$ Page 1 of 5 $\,$ Page ID #:f 1

21

22

23

24

25

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. Jurisdiction of this Court over Counts I of Plaintiff's Complaint arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and 28 U.S.C. § 1367 grants this court supplemental jurisdiction over the state claims contained herein.
- 4. Defendant conducts business in the State of California thereby establishing personal jurisdiction.
- 5. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Walnut, Los Angeles County, California.
- 7. Defendant is a business entity with a principal place of business in New York, New York.
- 8. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 9. In or around 2015, Defendant began constantly and continuously places collection calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged debt owed for a student loan.
- 10. Plaintiff's alleged debt arose through a consumer credit transaction.
- 11. Defendant places collection calls from telephone numbers, including, but not limited to, 800-388-2200.
- 12. Defendant places collection calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone at phone number 909-576-42XX.
- 13. Base upon the timing and frequency of Defendant's calls and per its prior business practices, each of Defendant's calls were placed using an automatic telephone dialing system.
- 14. On or around May 8, 2015, Plaintiff spoke to Defendant's representative, "Katherine" and requested that Defendant cease placing calls to her cellular telephone.

- 15. Plaintiff revoked any consent, express, implied or otherwise, to receive automated collection calls from Defendant.
- 16. Despite Plaintiff's repeated requests to cease, Defendant continued to place multiple collection calls to Plaintiff on a daily basis, including at least forty-one (41) automated collection calls to Plaintiff over an approximate two-month period.

COUNT I

DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTIONS ACT

- 17. Defendant's actions alleged *supra* constitute numerous negligent violations of the TCPA, entitling Plaintiff to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 18. Defendant's actions alleged *supra* constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violates of the TCPA, entitling Plaintiff to an award of \$1500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

Wherefore, Plaintiff, DAISY CHATTANOND, respectfully requests judgment be entered against Defendant, CITIBANK, N.A. for the following:

- 19. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each and every negligent violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § (b)(3)(B);
- 20. Statutory damages of \$1500.00 for each and every knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § (b)(3)(b) and 47 U.S.C. § (b)(3)(C);
- 21. All court costs, witness fees and other fees incurred; and
- 22. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

1 2

3

5

6

4

7

9

8

10

11

12 13

1415

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

COUNT II

DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 23. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all of the allegations in Count I of Plaintiff's Complaint as the allegations in Count II of Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 24. Defendant violated the RFDCPA based on the following:
 - a. Defendant violated § 1788.11(d) of the RFDCPA by causing a telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously to annoy the person called;
 - b. Defendant violated § 1788.11(e) of the RFDCPA by communicating with Plaintiff with such frequency as to be unreasonable and to constitute a harassment to Plaintiff.
 - c. Defendant violated § 1788.17 of the RFDCPA by failing to comply with the Fair Debt Collection Practices, Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.*, to wit:
 - 1. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by engaging in conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff;
 - Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA by causing a telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with intent to annoy, harass, or abuse Plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, DAISY CHATTANOND, respectfully requests judgment be entered against Defendant, CITIBANK, N.A. for the following:

- 25. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code §1788.30(b),
- 26. Costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ Code § 1788.30(c), and
- 27. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

Case 2:15-cv-07734-GHK-AFM Document 1 Filed 10/01/15 Page 5 of 5 Page ID #:5